DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 482 702 JC 030 679

AUTHOR	Beas, Allison; Zarkesh, Maryam
TITLE	Indicators & Community Colleges Trends, 2000-2003.
PUB DATE	2003-00-00
NOTE	23p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Colleges; Educational Assessment; *Educational Indicators; Educational Needs; Educational Objectives; Educational Planning; Evaluation Methods; Financial Support; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

This study updates the Education Commission of the States' (ECS) Report on State Funding for Community Colleges: a 50 State Survey, which examined the way community colleges were funded by each state. Specifically, the study addresses the use of performance-based indicators in community colleges. The data was gathered by calling individual community colleges or the educational governing board of each state. The study concludes that there has been an increase in the number of indicators, which are currently in use. A shift has occurred in how indicators are defined. Specifically, current indicators are more narrowly defined that those previously used. Although not all states have performance based funding as a policy, community colleges do use the indicators to gain additional funds from the state government. Furthermore, some community colleges use indicators to increase tuition. The large number of states that have changed their policy regarding indicators can be viewed as an indication of future changes in regards to how community colleges are funded. Furthermore, it is logical to assume that with the current national and state budget constraints further pressure will be added onto state education boards to make colleges responsible for outcomes. (MZ)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Zarkesh

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Indicators & Community Colleges Trends 2000-2003

By Allison Beas & Maryam Zarkesh

ED 482 702

Introduction

In 2000, the Education Commission of the States published a study named a Report on State Funding for Community Colleges: a 50 State Survey, which examined the way community colleges were funded by each state. Specifically, the study was focused on whether states required community colleges to report information regarding performance indicators on an annual basis. The study was published in November and was relevant to numerous other studies that were published at the same time or have been published since then regarding indicators and their link to performance based funding.

The Education Commission of the States has not updated the study since the time that it was first published. Upon contact, the Education Commission of the States reported that they had attempted to update the survey and had sent out follow-up surveys to each state. Unfortunately, due to a lack of funding for the project and staff changes they have been unable to complete the survey and they do not anticipate completing the project in the near future.

The goal of this study is to update the Education Commission of the States report.

Terminology

Indicators, performance based funding, and state funding formulas are important terms to define prior to a discussion of this study.

An indicator measures the performance of a college in a specific area. Indicators are used for a variety of reasons. For example, they are often used to allocate funding, to award grants, and for annual reporting purposes. Some common indicators are transfer rate, graduation rate, and persistence rate. Transfer rate refers to the number of community college students that upon

TC030679

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

completion of their requirements at community college continue to a four-year, baccalaureate granting university or college. Graduation rate is another common indicator that counts the number of students that were granted an A.A. degree or a license during the span of one academic year at a community college. Some colleges continue to track students after graduation in order to find out how many students continue on with their education or become successfully employed. This information can be used as an additional indicator and is referred to as success after graduation. Persistence is another commonly used indicator, which is measured by tracking cohorts within a one year to three-year period. If students withdraw from school during the defined period, then the persistence rate is lowered. One should note that community colleges are set apart from other higher education institutions in the United States because of their open door policy, which allows students to enroll in school and take a leave of absence without penalty. Therefore, it is somewhat contradictory to measure the success of a community college based upon persistence rate when the community college is fulfilling its mission by allowing students to withdraw and reenroll as needed.

Performance based funding is a procedure that uses performance indicators to decide how much funding is allocated to each community college. The use of performance based funding has gained popularity in recent years mainly due to the public's dissatisfaction with the rising cost of higher education and a desire for accountability through outcomes.

State funding formulas are used by various states in order to disperse funding for each academic year. Formulas take into account a variety of factors depending on the state. Some states only take in account enrollment rates for the previous year, while others take into account performance as well.

Background

As stated in the introduction, the ECS report was published in November 2000 and was relevant to numerous other studies that were published at the same time or have been published since then regarding indicators and their link to performance based funding.

One key study to consider regarding indicators is *Core Indicators of Effectiveness for Community Colleges* by Richard Alfred, Kay McClenney, James Hudgins, and Peter Ewell. The book describes the ever-changing background against which colleges must operate. Additionally, the book provides a list of fourteen common indicators (which are the same as the indicators used by the American Association of Community Colleges) used in the process of assessment. The indicators are organized according to the mission categories of colleges.

An important resource to utilize regarding performance based funding indicators is *Trends is Community College Financing: Challenges of the Past, Present, and Future* by Linda Strauss. In addition to discussing performance indicators as a means of supplemental state funding, this article also provides information regarding other sources of funding such as funding formulas (discussed in this paper in the "Oddities" section), differential tuition, and using grants and contracts for services. This article, which was published in 2001, provides a good overview of how current fiscal troubles have caused community colleges to turn to new funding sources.

Lastly, *Responding to Accountability Mandate*s written by Charles Outcalt and Joel Rabin discusses the connection between performance indicators and the trend towards greater accountability in the twenty first century. The article discusses specific cases of community colleges that have created assessment programs due to new state guidelines that require more accountability from community colleges. Furthermore, the article examines community colleges

that have implemented assessment programs even though they are not required to do so by the state.

Methodology

The information utilized in this study originated from several sources. The Report on State Funding for Community Colleges: a 50 State Survey Educational Commission of the States was used as a reference source for this study (refer to appendix C). The population size for this study was the 49 states since we were unable to contact Louisiana successfully. To update the stated indicators in the Education Commission of the States report, the governing board of each state was contacted via telephone and/or e-mail using a questionnaire that was approved by Dr. Arthur Cohen. Refer to appendix A for the instrument.

Community colleges in each state were also contacted via telephone and/or e-mail using the same questionnaire. Overall, a total of thirty-four community colleges and fifteen commissioning governing boards were contacted for information. Phone calls were made to governing boards and community colleges between 9AM-5PM. Conversations were not recorded electronically. Notes were transcribed after completion of interview. E-mails were made to governing boards and community colleges between 1PM-6PM. Interviewees responded to the e-mail in text. Any additional information from the interviewees to interviewers was sent as attachments. Notes were transcribed upon completion of an interview via e-mail.

Data

The number of states using indicators did varies from the year 2000 as compared to 2003. Seventeen states used indicators in the year 2000 compared to twenty-three states use indicators in the year 2003. The total number of indicators in use is greater in the year 2003 as compared to year 2000. (Table 1 &2)

Table 1. Performance Indicators For Community Colleges: Cross Comparison of Most Popular Indicators in 2000 & 2003

Most Popular Indicators	#States Using Indicators	
	2000	2003
1.Transfer Rate	17	11
2.Employment Rate	14	10
3.Certficate/Licensure Pass Rate	8	10
4.Graduation Rate	7	12
5.Retention/Persistence Rate	7	10
6.Degree Completion	7	8
7.Partnership with Industry	6	3
8.Employer Feedback	4	4
9.*Degree Conferred	3	-
10.*Number of Credit hours taught by Faculty/Faculty Instruction Workload	3	5
11.Strategic Plan	2	0
12.Attainment of Goals	2	0
13.Best Management Practice	2	0
14.Performance After Transfer	0	6
15.Service Area	0	4
16.Class Size	0	3
17.Continuing Education	0	3
18.Remediation	0	2
19.Program Review	0	2
20.Program Accreditation	0	2

*Data from ECS Report 2000 (n=48 since no information is provided for North Carolina). *Data from Indicators and Community College Trends 2000-2003 (n=49 we were unable to contact Louisiana successfully).

*Degree Conferred and Degree Completion indicators were combined for 2003.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2. Performance Indicators For Community Colleges: Frequency of Use Across States

Data From ECS Report 2000	
Indicator	#States Using Indicator
Transfer Rate	17
Employment Rate	14
Certificate/Licensure Pass Rate	8
Graduation Rate	7
Retention/Persistence Rate	7
Degree Completion	7
Partnership With Industry	6
Employer Feedback	4
Degree Conferred	3
Number of credit hours taught by Faculty	3
Strategic Plan	2
Attainment of Goals	2
Best Management Practice	2
Performance After Transfer	0
Service Area	0
Class Size	0
Continuing Education	0
Remediation	0
Program Accreditation	0

Data from Indicators and Community College Trends 2000-2003	
Indicator	#States Using Indicator
Graduation Rate	12
Transfer Rate	11
Employment Rate	10
Retention/Persistence Rate	10
Certificate/Licensure Pass Rate	10
Degree Conferred	8
Performance After Transfer	6
Faculty Instruction Workload	5
Employer Feedback	4
Service Area	4
Partnership With Industry	3
Class Size	3
Continuing Education	3
Remediation	2
Program Accreditation	2
Program Review	2
Mission Institution Goals	2
Strategic Plan	0
Attainment of Goals	0
Best Management Practice	0

*Data from ECS Report 2000 (n=48 since no information is provided for North Carolina). *Data from Indicators and Community College Trends 2000-2003 (n=49 we were unable to contact Louisiana successfully).

Major Findings Regarding Indicators

Forty-seven percent (23/49) of the states are utilizing indicators. This figure includes states where indicators are not linked to funding as well as states where indicators are directly linked to funding. Only nine states adhere to performance based funding where indicators are

BEST COPY AVAILABLE BEST COPY AVAILABLE

directly linked to funding. It should be noted that the sheer number of indicators used by states in the year 2003 has increased since the year 2000. Thirteen indicators were used in the ECS report as compared to sixteen indicators that are presently in use (refer to appendix B for definitions of the most frequently used indicators). There are presently seven new indicators in use that were not used in 2000. Furthermore, the ECS report included three indicators (strategic plan, attainment of goals, and best management practices), which are no longer being used.

Since the 2000 ECS report, a shift has occurred in how indicators are defined. Specifically, current indicators are more narrowly defined that those previously used. This change can be attributed to the fact narrowly defined indicators measure a specific aspect of an institution more effectively than a broad indicator. For example, in the year 2000 the most commonly used indicator was transfer rate. In the year 2003, the indicator of transfer rate has been transformed into two separate indicators: transfer rate and performance after transfer. The performance after transfer indicator takes into account the following information: the type of institution a student attends after transferring, the student's G.P.A., and/or the student's standing at their new institution. Overall, only a few broad indicators are currently in use. The most popularly used broad indicators are mission goals, service area, and partnership with industry.

Major Findings Regarding Performance Based Funding

Performance based funding is a procedure that uses performance indicators to decide how much funding is allocated to each community college. Nine states use performance based funding. Table 3 shows the most frequently used indicators for these states.

Table 3. Indicators used in Performance Based Funding

Data from Indicators and Community College Trends 2000-2003	
Indicator	**# States Using Indicator**
Graduation Rate	7
Employment Rate	6
Transfer Rate	4
Retention/Persistence Rate	4
Performance After Transfer	4

Graduation rates, employment rate, transfer rate, retention/persistence rate, and performance after transfer are the most commonly used indicators tied to funding. These indicators are directly geared towards accountability and are measured in quantifiable manner. Table 4 illustrates the indicators that are most commonly used in states in where indicators are not tied to funding. Transfer rate and retention/persistence rate are two indicators that are used in states where indicators are linked to funding as well as states where indicators are not linked to funding.

Table 4. Indicators used in Non-Performance Based Funding States

Data from Indicators and Community College Trends 2000-2003	
Indicator	**# States Using Indicator**
Transfer Rate	7
Degree Completion/Conferred	7
Licensure/Pass Rate	7
Retention/Persistence Rate	6
Faculty/instruction workload	5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Oddities

One should note that although only a small number of states link funding directly with indicators, many states do use the indicators to gain additional funds from the state government. One creative way of gaining funding is to use indicators to increase tuition . For example, in West Virginia State College is given the opportunity to raise tuition annually if it performs at a certain specified level on quality-evaluation test. Indicators are utilized as a part of the quality-level evaluation test and ranking in this evaluation determines how much an institution can increase tuition. The higher a community college scores, the more they can raise their tuition. West Virginia State College is a good example of how it is beneficial for community colleges to utilize indicators to receive r .e funding even if the state board does not use performance based funding.

In addition to using indicators as a justification to raise tuition, some community colleges use indicators as a bargaining tool with the state. For example, although indicators are not directly linked to funding in Delaware, community colleges utilize indicators when they make requests for funding. Community colleges request support directly from the state legislature on an annual basis. The indicators are used to persuade the state legislature that a community college needs or deserves to receive funding. For example, last year Delaware Technical & Community College made a bargain deal with the state legislature using indicators. The state was concerned with the shortage of dental assistants and requested that Delaware Tech create a focus on the certification program for dental assistants. Tech College agreed and stated that based on indicators of how many students they currently have enrolled and anticipate to pass the licensure exam they should have x amount of dollars. They were given the funds that they asked for with the speculation that indicators for number of students that pass the dental assistant

licensure exam for the following year will increase. Delaware Technical & Community College is a good example of how community college can utilize indicators to secure funds even the state itself does not directly link funding to indicators.

It should be noted that despite the popularity of performance based funding indicators, many states have returned to using state formulas to gain funding instead. These formulas are often complicated, but mainly factor in enrollment counts and inflation rate. The Colorado Community College System is an example of how states disperse money to schools based upon formulas. It 2000, five percent of funding for community colleges depended on indicators. According to the Colorado Community College website, currently each school "receives state money through a formula that funds resident enrollment and performance. The amount of funding for performance is based on the level of individual institutional performance associated with the indicators in the state's Quality Indicator System (QIS). Institutional performance on each indicator is determined by the earning of points related to the benchmark for that indicator. The benchmark represents an expected level of performance by the institution based on its historical data for that indicator."

Mississippi is another example of a state that has returned to using state funding formulas. Up until the early part of 2003, each Mississippi community college was required to report indicators to the state on a biannual basis, but the state no longer provides additional funding based upon performance based indicators. Currently funding for community colleges is negotiated based upon a formula that takes into account enrollment and inflation. Indicators are still reported to the states twice a year, but they are no longer linked to funding.

Conclusion

There have been many changes since the ECS report. Twenty-nine percent (14/48) of the states have updated their information since then while seventy-one percent (34/48) of the states have remained the same. The large number of states that have changed their policy regarding indicators can be viewed as an indication of future changes in regards to how community colleges are funded. Furthermore, it is logical to assume that with the current national and state budget constraints further pressure will be added onto state education boards to make colleges responsible for outcomes.

It should be noted that despite the popularity of performance based funding indicators, many of the states do not use performance based funding. Only eighteen percent (9/49) of the states use performance based funding. Despite the fact that many states do not mandate performance indicators statewide, many colleges in these states utilize indicators as way to ask for extra funds or increase tuition. Indicators have become an effective bargaining tool for individual community colleges.

The states that do use performance-based indicators for funding continue to use stated indicators or are improving their stated indicators to better fit the missions of the school and to better serve the diverse student population. Others states have stopped using performance based funding and have returned to a traditional form of funding of x amount of dollar per student at each institution. Many of the community colleges use performance indicators just for self-monitoring, growth of their institutions, and if necessary to ask for extra funds.

Overall, indicators serve a variety of functions for community colleges. They are used to receive direct funding from the state, as an instrument of self-measurement, a measure of success or lack thereof in specified areas, and a bargaining tool to receive additional grants.

Appendix

Appendix A

Indicators & Community Colleges Trends 2000-2003

Questionnaire format for phone calls/e-mails made to community colleges and state commissions

Hello. We are Maryam Zarkesh and Allison Marcela Beas. We are UCLA graduate students in the department of higher education and organizational change. We are currently enrolled in a seminar about community colleges that is taught by Dr. Arthur Cohen. We are working on a research project with the goal to update information published by the Education Commission of the States in November 2000. The ECS published a report which provided information about performance based indicators being used by community colleges. In order to update the information provided in the survey, we would like to ask you questions regarding indicators that you currently use in your state.

1. Do you have a recent report of the indicators used in your state?
   If so please send/e-mail us a copy of these indicators. Skip to question four. If not, we read/state the list of indictors used in the ECS report for their state.
2. Are any of these indicators no longer being used?
3. Do you use any indicators that we did not name/state?

4a. (State commission) Do you provide extra funding for colleges that produce a positive change according to the stated indicator?

4b. (Community college) Does the state provide your institution with extra funding if your college produces a positive change according to the stated indicators?

5. How do you define the terms such as student satisfaction/student learning outcomes/institutional efficiency/etc.?
   For this question we shall refer to Appendix B in the ECS report published in November 2000, which lists the specific indicators used by each state. We will only ask questions based upon indicators used in that state.

Appendix B

Definitions of Indicators

Certificate/Licensure Pass Rate-The proportion of students who completed or graduated from community college vocational program and then actively seek and obtain licensure or certification

Class Size- Faculty to student ratio

Continuing Education-Measures the number of non-completers, non-returning students who are employed or pursuing additional education

Degree Conferred-Number of Degrees awarded

Employer Feedback-Employers feedback on recent graduates working in their organization

Employment Rate-The number of students who are employed 6 months to a year after their completion of program

Faculty Instruction Workload-Number of credit hours taught by full time equivalent faculty

Graduation Rate- indicator that counts the number of students that were granted an A.A. Degree or a license during the span of one academic year at a community college

Mission Institution Goals- Evaluates progress toward specific goals contained in institutional mission goals of the community college

Partnership With Industry-The number and the extent of partnership maintained by the institution and the benefits thereof

Performance After Transfer- Measures the type of institution a student attends after transferring, G.P.A., and/or if the student is in good standing at their new institution

Program Accreditation- evaluation of accredited programs

Program Review- This assessment indicator is designed to measure the quality of a program, placement of program graduates and accreditation

Remediation-Completion rates for students receiving remediation

Retention/Persistence Rate- Commonly measured by cohorts within a one year or three year period

Service Area- Community service organized by the community college within the past year

Transfer Rate- The number of community college students that upon completion of their requirements at community college continue to a four-year, baccalaureate granting university

APPENDIX A

State-by-State Community College Performance Indicators

State	Indicators
AK	None
AL	None
AR	Performance indicators are not currently being used.
AZ	1. Participation rate 2. Ethnic and racial representation 3. Financial aid awards 4. Developmental education 5. Course availability 6. Occupational program participation and completion rates 7. Placement and wages 8. Employer satisfaction 9. Number of transfer students 10. Success of transfer students 11. Effectiveness of the New Transfer Model 12. Small business development centers 13. Social,economic and/or cultural development activities 14. Student learning outcomes
CA	(Partnership for Excellence) 1. Successful course completion 2. Degrees and certificates awarded 3. Transfers to four-year institutions 4. Workforce development 5. Basic skills improvement 6. Transfer preparedness
CO	1. Graduation rates and credits for degree 2. Faculty instructional productivity 3. Freshman persistence 4.Achievement rates 5. Lower-division class size 6.Approved and implemented diversity plan 7. Institutional support costs 8. Institutional selected indicator 9.Another institutional selected indicator
CT	New requirement currently being developed and may include: 1. Student learning and academic excellence -Written,oral, reading and critical thinking skills -Performance on licensure exams 2. Joining with elementary and secondary education -High school articulation -Innovative projects with K-12 3.Access and affordability -Real price to students to attend institution -Percent of operating expenditures from state support -Percent of financial aid from federal support -Distance education opportunities 4. Economic development -Credit-free headcount -Numbers of employers and employees served,net revenue generated -Programs to meet employer needs

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

5. Responsiveness to societal issues
   - Headcount and grades of basic skills reading,writing, English students
   - Headcount and grades of basic skills math students
   - Sharing of resources with community
   - Provision of specialized services to the community
6. Efficient use of resources
   - Percent of operating expenditures for instruction, public/community service, academic support,student services and student financial aid
   - Faculty productivity
   - Retention rate
   - Graduation rate

DE Even though the state does not require performance indicators, DTCC has established performance measures that include but are not limited to:
1. Student enrollment
2. Credit awards
3. Degree recipients
4. Percent of students transferred to senior institutions
5. Percent of degree recipients of employees

FL 1.The outputs are AA degrees awarded,the number of dual-enrolled credit hours generated divided by 60,and additional points are awarded for special population completers.
2.The outcomes are AA degree completers who transfer to a university or are placed in a job. Partial completers of AA degree who transfer are also counted as outcomes.

GA None

HI None

IA None

ID Idaho requires reporting performance indicators but there are not specific indicators that must be reported. Typical indicators such as numbers of students,graduation rates, job placement, etc.are reported.

IL For the Illinois Community College System, there are six statewide indicators that account for 60% of the Performance based Incentive System (PBIS) dollars and include:
1. Student satisfaction (12%)
2. Student education advancement (12%)
3. Student success in employment/continued pursuit of education (12%)
4. Student transfer to four-year institutions (8%)
5. Population served (8%)
6.Academically disadvantaged
7. Student success (8%)

District-based component funding accounts for 40% of PBIS dollars.The district-based component should reflect autonomy, mission differentiation,and community needs. College officials choose one of the following three areas to focus their local PBIS initiatives on over a five-year time span.
1. Responsiveness to local need
2. Technology
3. Workforce Development

IN Periodic reporting, along with four-year institutions. Measures vary and not reported every year.

KS Under development.

KY None

LA
1. Job placements
2. Percentage of programs accredited
3. Certificates awarded
4. Diplomas awarded
5. Percent administrative expenditures
6. Percent instructional expenditures
7. Number of distance learning sites
8. Student satisfaction indicator will be implemented in FY 2001-2002

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MA

1. Percentage of community college system operational funding derived from state and local government appropriations compared to national average
2. Community college system national ranking in average tuition and fees cost
3. Cost of education
4. Annualized unduplicated credit headcount
5. Unduplicated headcount of students enrolled in credit courses: number full-time and number part-time
6. Total FTE
7. Annualized total number of enrollments in non-credit college offerings
8. Unduplicated credit headcount by gender
9. Unduplicated credit headcount by race
10. Unduplicated credit headcount by 24 years and under; by 25 years and older
11. Unduplicated credit headcount with documented disability
12. Number of enrollments in credit programming offered by the college at off-campus locations
13. Percentage of total unduplicated credit student enrolled who receive federal financial aid
14. Course credit completion rate
15. Number of degrees and certificates awarded
16. Licensure exam pass rate
17. Percentage positive placement rate of career program graduates
18. Percentage of graduates from transfer programs who enrolled in another institution of higher education
19. Assessment of students' perceptions regarding achievement of their education goals from attending a community college
20. Percentage of graduates of career-oriented programs who are employed in a related field or transfer within one year of graduation
21. Percentage of Massachusetts' employers who employ community college graduates
22. Annualized not-for-credit, workforce development/job skills training courses offered by the college
23. Number of annualized participants in not-for-credit, workforce development/job skills training courses at the college
24. Percent of career-related degree and credit certificate programs that utilize advisory boards
25. Number of colleges with an established institutional process for economic and labor market analysis
26. Community service activities by campus
27. Percent of community colleges making the following types of services available to their local communities (11 separate items)
28. Total education and general expenditures (not including federal/state student financial aid)
29. Percentage of education and general expenditures attributed to institutional support
30. Percentage of education and general expenditures attributed to instructional costs
31. Adaptation and renewal as percentage of replacement costs
32. Number of formalized current articulation agreements between community colleges and four-year public/private colleges and universities
33. Number of students participating in the Joint Admissions Program.
34. Collaborative/partnering arrangements and projects involving other community colleges and/or four-year public/private colleges and universities
35. Percent of K-12 school districts in the service area with which the community college is collaborating/working to provide educational related services
36. Description of community college-sponsored activities/projects targeted to K-12 in which community colleges provide direct services to local school/school districts
37. Total gifts eligible for endowment match
38. Percentage of community colleges meeting or exceeding the endowment challenge goal

MD

1. Student satisfaction with job preparation
2. Employer satisfaction with CC graduates
3. Student satisfaction with transfer preparation
4. CC transfer student success: GPA first year
5. Second year retention rate
6. Second year retention rates of developmental students (placed)
7. Licensure exams passing rate
8. Four-year transfer and graduation rate
9. Number students transferring to MD public four-year institutions
10. Tuition and fees in state/county
11. Percent county population served

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

12. Continuing education (noncredit) registrations
13. Percent African-American of all undergraduates
14. Percent all minorities of all undergraduates
15. Percent African-American full-time core faculty
16. Percent women full-time core faculty
17. Percent African-American full-time executive/managerial
18. Percent women full-time executive/managerial
19. Transfer/graduation rate of African-American students
20. Transfer/graduation rate of all minority students
21. Percent LCD SCH generated by core faculty
22. Percent budget to instruction
23. Dollars in private giving
24. Dollars endowment value

ME
1. Enrollment
2. Success rates
3. Other factors

MI A generic process that is not published by the executive office. This is not an issue in Michigan - local control and general appropriations are too strong.

MN None

MO
1. Assessment of graduates
2. Performance of graduates
3. Degree/certificate productivity
4. Success of underrepresented groups
5. Successful transfers
6. Successful job placement

MS
1. Cumulative grade point average of community college transfer students attending state institutions of higher learning will equal or exceed the GPA earned by native student in the same university system. 2.70
2. Average range of class.16-30
3. Percentage of CJC associate degree nursing graduates who pass the state board nursing exam on the first write.95.16%
4. Percentage of full-time and adjunct faculty who met the criteria for academic and professional preparation. 99.95%
5. Percentage of vocation-technical students who complete or exit a program and are considered positively place etc.,83.90%

MT None

NC
1. Progress of basic-skills students
2. Performance of college transfer students
3. Passing rates for licensure and certification exams
4. Passing rates of student in developmental courses
5. Success rate of developmental students in subsequent college-level courses (data dependent on Data Warehouse project)
6. Program enrollment
7. Student satisfaction: completers and noncompleters
8. Goal completion of completers
9. Curriculum student progress and success
10. Employer satisfaction with graduates
11. Employment status of graduates
12. Client satisfaction with customized training

ND None

NE None

NH None

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NJ Improved graduation rates:
1. Three-year SURE (+) combined graduation and/or transfer rate for a full freshman cohort.
2. Three-year SURE (+) comprehensive success rate for a full freshman cohort.
3. Three-year combined graduation and/or SURE (+) transfer rate for TAG recipients in the bottom two cells of the TAG table (student at risk).
4. Three-year SURE (+) comprehensive success rate for TAG recipients in the bottom two cells of the TAG table (students at risk).
5. Average time to completion of the degree.

Improved transfer and articulation:
1. Three-year SURE +0 rate of transfer to senior institutions for freshmen in cc transfer programs.
2. Junior-year mean GOA of transfers to a senior public institution from a particular community college.
3. Graduation rate for cc students who transfer to a senior public institution.

Improved efficiency and effectiveness:
1. Percent of associate-degree programs with 25 or fewer students enrolled.
2. Collaboration - academic, administrative/student service, and community service.
3. Assessment of graduates.

Diversified revenues
1. Increase in tuition
2. External funding
3. Continuing education revenue

NM Yet to be determined

NV None

NY A system of performance indicators and some degree of performance-based funding are under development.

OH
1. An appropriate range of career or technical programs designed to prepare individuals for employment in specific careers at the technical or paraprofessional level
2. Commitment to an effective array of developmental education services providing opportunities for academic skill enhancement
3. Partnerships with industry, business,government and labor for the retraining of the workforce and the economic development of the community
4. Noncredit continuing education opportunities
5. College transfer programs or the initial two years of a baccalaureate degree for students planning to transfer to institutions offering baccalaureate programs
6. Linkages with high schools to ensure that graduates are adequately prepared for post-secondary instruction
7. Student access provided according to a convenient schedule and program quality provided at an affordable price
8. Student fees charged by any institution are as low as possible, especially if the institution is being supported by a local tax levy
9. A high level of community involvement in the decisionmaking process in such critical areas as course delivery, range of services,fees and budgets, and administrative personnel

OK
1. Graduation rates
2. Transfer rates
3. Time to degree completion
4. Certification/licensure pass rates
5. Employment rates
6. Remediation rates
7. Degrees conferred
8. Assessment activity

OR None

PA None

RI None

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SC
1. Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission
2. Curricula offered to achieve mission
3. Approval of a mission statement
4. Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement
5. Attainment of goals of the strategic plan
6. Academic and other credential of professors and instructors
7. Performance review systems for faculty to include student and peer evaluations
8. Post-tenure review for tenured faculty
9. Compensation of faculty
10. Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom
11. Community or public service activities of faculty for which no extra compensation is paid
12. Class sizes and student/teacher ratios
13. Number of credit hours taught by faculty
14. Ratio of full-time faculty as compared to other full-time employees
15. Institutional emphasis on quality teacher education and reform
16. Sharing and use of technology, programs,equipment,supplies, and source matter experts within the institution with other institutions, and the business community
17. Cooperation and collaboration with private industry
18. Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs
19. Use of best management practices
20. Elimination of unjustified duplication of and waste in administrative and academic programs
21. Amount of general overhead costs
22. SAT and ACT scores of student body
23. High school standing, gradepoint averages, and activities of student body
24. Post-secondary nonacademic achievement of student body
25. Priority of enrolling in-state students
26. Graduation rate
27. Employment rate for graduates
28. Employer feedback on graduates who were employed or not employed
29. Scores of graduates on post-graduate professional,graduate or employment-related examinations and certification tests
30. Number of graduates who continue their education
31. Credit hours earned of graduates
32. Transferability of credits to and from the institution
33. Continuing education programs for graduates and others
34. Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the state
35. Financial support for reform in teacher education
36. Amount of public- and private-sector grants

SD None

TN
1. Testing of General Ed outcomes
2. Pilot evaluation of General Ed outcomes
3. Accreditation
4. Undergraduate and graduate program review
5. Major field-testing
6. Enrolled/alumni surveys
7. Retention/Persistence
8. Job placement
9. Strategic plan goals

TX
1. Rate at which students completed courses attempted
2. Number and types of degrees and certificates awarded
3. Percentage of graduates who passed licensing exams related to the degree or certificate awarded,to the extent the information can be determined
4. Number of students or graduates who transfer to or are admitted to a public university
5. Passing rates for students required to be tested under Section 51.306
6. Percentage of students enrolled who are academically disadvantaged
7. Percentage of students enrolled who are economically disadvantaged
8. Racial and ethnic composition of the district's student body

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

9. Percentage of student contact hours taught by full-time faculty

UT
1. Faculty instructional workload
2. Transfer efficiency with 4-year institutions
3. Time to graduation (where appropriate)
4. Student scores on norm-referenced licensure exams

VA
1. Graduation rate
2. Progressions rate (students returning to same institution at higher level)
3. Retention rate (returning students,but not progressing to higher level)
4. Persistence rate (students returning regardless of program placed level)
5. Transfer rate to four-year institutions
6. Graduates employed in program-related work
7. Graduates pursuing further study
8. Instruction as percent of educational and general expenditures
9. Achieving management standards (clean audit,prompt payments, etc.)
10. Percent occupancy - classrooms
11. Weekly room use hours - classrooms
12. Percent occupancy - class labs
13. Weekly room use hours - class labs
14. Weekly station use hours - classrooms
15. Weekly station use hours - class labs
16. Total credit hours per full-time equivalent faculty

VT None

WA
1. Number of transfer students from 35,000-50,000/year
2. Number of job-ready student from 14,0000-25,000/year
3. Increase % students with basic skills gains from 37% to 80%

WI None

WV None

WY
1. Student goal attainment
2. Persistence
3. Degree completion rates
4. Placement rate in the workforce
5. Employer assessment of students
6. Licensure/certification pass rates
7. Client assessment of programs and services
8. Demonstration of critical literacy skills
9. Demonstration of citizenship skills
10. Number and rate who transfer
11. Performance after transfer
12. Success in subsequent, related coursework
13. Participation rate in service area
14. Responsiveness to community needs

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Indicators and Community Colleges Trends 2000-2003
Author(s): Allison Beas, Maryam Zarkesh
Corporate Source: / Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Maryam Zarkesh	Printed Name/Position/Title: Maryam Zarkesh,
Organization/Address: University of California, Los Angeles 305, Moore Hall, Los Angeles CA 90095	Telephone: 310-479-8130 / FAX:
	E-Mail Address: maryam@ucla.edu / Date: 1/15/03

01/16/2004 13:50 13102068095 ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE PAGE 01

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: info@ericfac.piccard.csc.com
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

01/16/2004 13:50 13102068095 ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE PAGE 02